



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/784,321	02/16/2001	Takaya Sato	8292.013	1858

7590

06/20/2003

APEX JURIS PLLC
13194 EDGEWATER LANE NORTHEAST
SEATTLE, WA 98125

EXAMINER

TSANG FOSTER, SUSY N

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1745

DATE MAILED: 06/20/2003

12

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Applicati n No.

09/784,321

Applicant(s)

SATO ET AL.

Examiner

Susy N Tsang-Foster

Art Unit

1745

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 March 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, 4-6, 31, 32, 34 and 35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, 4-6, 31, 32, 34, and 35 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election of claims 1-14 and 31-35 in Paper No. 11 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

It is noted that applicants stated in the remarks section in the amendment filed on 3/24/2003 that claims 3 and 7-14 have been cancelled. Examiner Tsang-Foster made a telephone call to Mr. Tracy Heims on June 5, 2003 and stated that there appears to be contradictions between the status of the claims in the new revised format section for the claims and the remarks section of the amendment. In the revised format section for the claims, claims 3, 7-30, and 33, and claims 36-53 are indicated as being withdrawn. However, claims 3 and 7-14 are indicated as being cancelled. For the purposes of prosecution, the Examiner is interpreting claims 3, 7-30, and 33, and claims 36-53 to be cancelled.

Priority

2. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Art Unit: 1745

Duplicate Claims

3. Applicant is advised that should claim 1 be found allowable, claim 31 will be objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate thereof. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

Applicant is advised that should claim 2 be found allowable, claim 32 will be objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate thereof. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

Applicant is advised that should claim 5 be found allowable, claim 35 will be objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate thereof. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Art Unit: 1745

5. Claims 6 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 6 is indefinite because it depends from cancelled claim 3.

In claim 32, the limitation “the binder of the first electrode layer formed in contact with the current collecting material has a stronger adhesive strength than the second electrode layer formed on the first electrode layer” is indefinite because the comparison is between two different things, the strength of the binder in the first electrode to the binding strength of the second electrode layer to the first electrode layer. For the purposes of prosecution, this limitation is interpreted as “the first electrode layer has a stronger adhesive strength relative to the current collecting material than the second electrode layer relative to the first electrode layer”.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

7. Claims 1, 4-6, 31, 34 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Vanderborgh et al. (US 4,804,592).

See abstract; Figures 1 and 2; col. 3, line 37 to col. 4, line 36; col. 5, lines 1-44; col. 6, line 33 to line 60; col. 8, lines 13 to 61 and especially Table 1 of the reference.

8. Claims 1, 2, 6, 31, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by the JPO machine translation for JP 11-67214 A.

The JPO machine translation for JP 11-67214 A discloses a multi-layered positive electrode structure comprising a first layer 3 and a second layer 4 where the first layer is coated on the current collector 1 (See Figure 2). The first layer is low resistance and the second layer is high resistance during overdischarge (see paragraph 9 of machine translation) such that the first electrode layer has a higher electrical conduction rate than the second electrode layer since it has a lower resistance. The active material used for the first electrode layer and that of the second electrode layer is different (see claim 8 of machine translation).

In a specific example, the first positive electrode layer comprised 5 weight section of polyvinylidene fluoride as a binder and 3 weight section artificial graphite and an active material (see paragraph 15 of machine translation). The second positive electrode layer comprised 5 weight section of polyaniline as binder and 95 weight section of active material (see paragraph 15 of machine translation). The use of polyvinylidene fluoride improves the adhesion of the first electrode layer to the current collector (see paragraph 7 of machine translation). Since polyvinylidene fluoride has a higher adhesive strength than polyaniline, the first electrode layer would have a stronger adhesive strength relative to the current collecting material than the second electrode layer relative to the first electrode layer.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications should be directed to examiner Susy Tsang-Foster, Ph.D. whose telephone number is (703) 305-0588. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 9:30 AM to 8:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patrick Ryan can be reached at (703) 308-2383. The phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 305-5900.

The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9310 for regular communications and (703) 872-9311 for After-Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

st/14 June 2003

Susy Tsang-Foster